

1 Karma M. Giulianelli (SBN 184175)
2 karma.gulianelli@bartlitbeck.com

3 **BARTLIT BECK LLP**
4 1801 Wewetta St., Suite 1200
5 Denver, Colorado 80202
6 Telephone: (303) 592-3100

7 Hae Sung Nam (*pro hac vice*)
8 hnam@kaplanfox.com
9 **KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP**
10 850 Third Avenue
11 New York, NY 10022
12 Tel.: (212) 687-1980

13 *Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class*
14 *in In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust*
15 *Litigation*

16 Steve W. Berman (*pro hac vice*)
17 steve@hbsslaw.com
18 **HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP**
19 1301 Second Ave., Suite 2000
20 Seattle, WA 98101
21 Telephone: (206) 623-7292

22 Eamon P. Kelly (*pro hac vice*)
23 ekelly@sperling-law.com
24 **SPERLING & SLATER P.C.**
25 55 W. Monroe, Suite 3200
26 Chicago, IL 60603
27 Telephone: 312-641-3200

28 *Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in In re*
29 *Google Play Developer Antitrust Litigation and*
30 *Attorneys for Pure Sweat Basketball, Inc.*

31 Bonny E. Sweeney (SBN 176174)
32 bsweeney@hausfeld.com
33 **HAUSFELD LLP**
34 600 Montgomery Street, Suite 3200
35 San Francisco, CA 94104
36 Telephone: (415) 633-1908

37 *Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in In re*
38 *Google Play Developer Antitrust Litigation and*
39 *Attorneys for Peekya App Services, Inc.*

40 [Additional counsel appear on signature page]

41 Paul J. Riehle (SBN 115199)
42 paul.riehle@faegredrinker.com
43 **FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE &**
44 **REATH LLP**

45 Four Embarcadero Center, 27th Floor
46 San Francisco, CA 94111
47 Telephone: (415) 591-7500

48 Christine A. Varney (*pro hac vice*)
49 cvarney@cravath.com
50 **CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP**
51 825 Eighth Avenue
52 New York, New York 10019
53 Telephone: (212) 474-1000

54 *Counsel for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc. in*
55 *Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al.*

56 Brendan P. Glackin (SBN 199643)
57 bglackin@agutah.gov
58 **OFFICE OF THE UTAH ATTORNEY**
59 **GENERAL**
60 160 E 300 S, 5th Floor
61 PO Box 140872
62 Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0872
63 Telephone: 801-366-0260

64 *Counsel for Utah*

65 Glenn D. Pomerantz (SBN 112503)
66 glenn.pomerantz@mto.com
67 **MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**
68 350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor
69 Los Angeles, California 90071
70 Telephone: (213) 683-9100

71 Brian C. Rocca (SBN 221576)
72 brian.rocca@morganlewis.com
73 **MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**
74 One Market, Spear Street Tower
75 San Francisco, CA 94105-1596
76 Telephone: (415) 442-1000

77 Daniel M. Petrocelli, Bar No. 97802
78 dpetrocelli@omm.com
79 **O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP**
80 1999 Avenue of the Stars, 7th Fl.
81 Los Angeles, CA 90067-6035
82 Telephone: (310) 553-6700

83 *Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

Epic Games Inc. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD

JOINT STATEMENT RE: CASE SCHEDULE AND TRIAL STRUCTURE

In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD

Judge: Hon. James Donato

In re Google Play Developer Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 3:20-cv-05792-JD

State of Utah et al. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:21-cv-05227-JD

Pursuant to this Court’s instruction at the conclusion of the December 16, 2021 status conference, the parties in the above-captioned MDL action (“the Parties”), by and through their undersigned counsel, submit this Joint Statement Regarding Case Schedule and Trial Structure.

I. CASE SCHEDULE

Based on the guidance provided by the Court at the last status conference, the Parties have met and conferred regarding a modified schedule for this MDL. The Parties jointly propose the case schedule attached as Exhibit A and set forth in the proposed order accompanying this filing based on a proposed trial date of January 30, 2023. As advised by the Court, this proposed schedule separates the *Daubert* and class certification motion hearings, separates the *Daubert* and dispositive motion hearings, sets deadlines for joint filings in advance of the concurrent expert proceedings and sets the hearing for dispositive motions two months before the final pretrial conference.

1 **II. TRIAL STRUCTURE**

2 The Parties have met and conferred regarding the structure of any trials. As the
3 Court has previously noted, 7/22/21 Tr. 7:22-8:7, the Complaints assert substantially similar
4 theories of antitrust liability. Given the Court’s guidance that the “optimal result” would be to
5 have “one jury decide[] in one sitting the core antitrust issues,” *see* 7/22/21 Tr. 29:03-24, the
6 Parties are planning to proceed accordingly with a combined jury trial on the core antitrust liability
7 issues common to the four cases.

8 With respect to the issue of damages, the Consumer Plaintiffs, Developer Plaintiffs,
9 State Plaintiffs, and Google Defendants respectfully suggest that the Court defer ruling further on
10 trial structure until after the close of expert discovery on August 19, 2022.¹ Whether there should
11 be a separate damages phase, and the structure of that phase, will be informed by factual evidence
12 still to be obtained in discovery, expert reports and depositions, motions practice, and other
13 developments that may occur over the next several months.

14 Likewise, with respect to Google’s counterclaims against Epic, Epic and Google
15 respectfully suggest that the Court defer ruling further on trial structure. Whether evidence and
16 arguments about Google’s counterclaims against Epic should be part of a liability trial in which all
17 Plaintiffs are present, or should instead be addressed during a separate phase or trial, will be
18 informed by factual evidence still to be obtained in discovery, expert reports and depositions,
19 motions practice, and other developments that may occur over the next several months.

20 The Parties jointly propose that they meet and confer on these issues promptly
21 following the close of expert discovery (which is set for August 19, 2022 under the schedule
22 jointly proposed by the Parties), and then meet with the Court to further discuss trial structure and
23 the length of any trials² with the benefit of a more developed record.

24
25 ¹ Plaintiff Epic has not asserted any claim for damages against Google and has no objection to the
other Parties’ suggestion that the Court defer ruling on the trial structure as it relates to the other
Plaintiffs’ damages claims.

26 ² At the December 16, 2021 status conference, the Court indicated that its preliminary view was
27 that the core antitrust liability issues could be tried over a three-week period with approximately
20-25 hours allotted to Plaintiffs and 20-25 hours allotted to Google. At this stage, Plaintiffs
28 anticipate needing more than three weeks to try the core antitrust liability issues due to the

1 Dated: January 14, 2022

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP
Christine Varney (*pro hac vice*)
Katherine B. Forrest (*pro hac vice*)
Gary A. Bornstein (*pro hac vice*)
Timothy G. Cameron (*pro hac vice*)
Yonatan Even (*pro hac vice*)
Lauren A. Moskowitz (*pro hac vice*)
Justin C. Clarke (*pro hac vice*)
M. Brent Byars (*pro hac vice*)

FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
Paul J. Riehle (SBN 115199)

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Yonatan Even
Yonatan Even

Counsel for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc.

12 Dated: January 14, 2022

BARTLIT BECK LLP
Karma M. Julianelli

KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP
Hae Sung Nam

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Karma M. Julianelli
Karma M. Julianelli

*Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in
In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust
Litigation*

20 Dated: January 14, 2022

PRITZKER LEVINE LLP
Elizabeth C. Pritzker

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Elizabeth C. Pritzker
Elizabeth C. Pritzker

*Liaison Counsel for the Proposed Class in
In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust
Litigation*

27 complexity and scope of the issues and the anticipated number of fact and expert witnesses.
28 Accordingly, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court revisit the appropriate length of trial at a
later stage of the case.

1 Dated: January 14, 2022

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
2 Steve W. Berman
Robert F. Lopez
3 Benjamin J. Siegel

SPERLING & SLATER PC
4 Joseph M. Vanek
Eamon P. Kelly
5 Alberto Rodriguez

6 Respectfully submitted,

7 By: /s/ Steve W. Berman
Steve W. Berman

8 *Co-Lead Interim Class Counsel for the
Developer Class and Attorneys for Plaintiff
9 Pure Sweat Basketball*

10 Dated: January 14, 2022

11 HAUSFELD LLP
12 Bonny E. Sweeney
13 Melinda R. Coolidge
14 Katie R. Beran
Scott A. Martin
Irving Scher

15 Respectfully submitted,

16 By: /s/ Bonny E. Sweeney
Bonny E. Sweeney

17 *Co-Lead Interim Class Counsel for the
Developer Class and Attorneys for Plaintiff
18 Peekya App Services, Inc.*

19 Dated: January 14, 2022

20 OFFICE OF THE UTAH ATTORNEY
21 GENERAL
22 Brendan P. Glackin

23 Respectfully submitted,

24 By: /s/ Brendan P. Glackin
Brendan P. Glackin

25 *Counsel for Utah*

1 Dated: January 14, 2022

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
Brian C. Rocca
Sujal J. Shah
Michelle Park Chiu
Minna L. Naranjo
Rishi P. Satia

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Brian C. Rocca
Brian C. Rocca

Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.

9 Dated: January 14, 2022

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
Daniel M. Petrocelli
Ian Simmons
Benjamin G. Bradshaw
Stephen J. McIntyre

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Daniel M. Petrocelli
Daniel M. Petrocelli

Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.

16 Dated: January 14, 2022

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
Glenn D. Pomerantz
Kyle W. Mach
Kuruvilla Olasa
Justin P. Raphael
Emily C. Curran-Huberty
Jonathan I. Kravis
Marianna Y. Mao

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Glenn D. Pomerantz
Glenn D. Pomerantz

Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.

E-FILING ATTESTATION

I, Kuruvilla Olasa, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this document. In compliance with Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that each of the signatories identified above has concurred in this filing.

/s/ Kuruvilla Olasa

Kuruvilla Olasa

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Exhibit A

ACTIVITY	DATE
Status Conferences	
Joint status conference	March 17, 2022, at 11 a.m. (by remote access)
Joint status conference	June 16, 2022, at 11 a.m. (by remote access)
Fact Discovery Cut-off	April 18, 2022
Class Certification	
Plaintiffs' Class Certification Motion	March 3, 2022
Plaintiffs' Class Certification expert report	March 3, 2022
Google's Class Certification Opposition	April 5, 2022
Google's Class Certification Expert Report	April 5, 2022
Google's <i>Daubert</i> Motion(s) re Class Certification Report	April 5, 2022
Plaintiffs' Class Certification Reply and <i>Daubert</i> Motion	April 29, 2022
Plaintiffs' Class Certification Reply Expert Report	April 29, 2022
Plaintiffs' Opposition to <i>Daubert</i> Motion	April 29, 2022
Google's <i>Daubert</i> Reply	May 6, 2022
Google's Motion re any Class Certification Reply Expert Report	May 6, 2022
Plaintiffs' Response to Google's Motion re Reply Expert Report	May 13, 2022
Concurrent Expert Proceeding Joint Submission	May 13, 2022
Concurrent Expert Proceedings/ <i>Daubert</i> Hearing	May 19, 2022
Class Certification Hearing	May 26, 2022
Merits Experts	
Plaintiffs' Merits Expert Reports	May 27, 2022

1	ACTIVITY	DATE
2	Google's Merits Expert Reports	July 1, 2022
3	Plaintiffs' Merits Replies	July 29, 2022
4	Expert Discovery Cut-Off	August 19, 2022
5	Dispositive/<i>Daubert</i> Motions	
6	Dispositive/ <i>Daubert</i> Motions	August 26, 2022
7	Dispositive/ <i>Daubert</i> Motion Responses	September 23, 2022
8	Dispositive/ <i>Daubert</i> Motion Replies	October 14, 2022
9	Concurrent Expert Proceeding Joint Statement	October 21, 2022
10	Concurrent Expert Proceeding/ <i>Daubert</i> Hearing	November 4, 2022
11	Dispositive Motion Hearing	November 17, 2022
12	Trial	
13	Serve (but not file) Motions in Limine	November 23, 2022
14	Serve (but not file) opposition to Motions in Limine	December 12, 2022
15	Pretrial Filings Due Date	December 16, 2022
16	Pre-Trial Conference	January 19, 2023
17	Trial Date	January 30, 2023
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		